

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Aronson* (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,787) in view of *Paul* (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,932). In response, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-23 are allowable for at least the following reasons.

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

a computer device of the user configured with a plurality of detection mechanisms that detect undesired email messages that have been received by the user from an email server; and

a user interface installed on the computer device and configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular detection mechanism, wherein each of the detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual representation.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Aronson* in view of *Paul* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “a user interface installed on the computer device and configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular detection mechanism, wherein each of the detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual representation,” as emphasized above.

Aronson describes a mail server with a filter module 220 that applies a set of rules for detecting spam. “Spam is then deposited in a spam storage area 230 while legitimate e-mail is then sent through to mailbox 140. In an alternative embodiment, spam is initially stored in a mailbox and is subsequently filtered using filter module 220.”

See col. 4, lines 34-44. The final Office Action states that “Aronson does not disclose expressly a user interface configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular mechanism.” Page 4. Further, the final Office Action asserts that “Paul discloses a user interface configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular detection mechanism.” Page 4.

In reviewing the reference, *Paul* describes that an electronic mail message that is allowed in accordance with a user’s inclusion list is marked with an “OK” display code. Further, an electronic message which does not match data on the user’s inclusion list may be determined to be of interest to the user and is marked with a “NEW” display code. An electronic message which does not match data on the user’s inclusion list may be determined to not be of interest to the user and is marked with a “JUNK” display code. See abstract. Each of these codes characterizes the content of a respective message with regard to whether the content is of interest to the user. The codes do not indicate a type of detection mechanism that determined the message to be undesirable.

Similarly, *Paul* describes that “e-mail messages from certain sources may be marked with a display code indicating that they have a ‘PRIORITY’ status. Different e-mail display colors or folders may be defined based upon the identity of the sender, or the subject matter of the messages.” Col. 9, lines 25-31. Accordingly, *Paul* discloses that the codes indicate content of the message or the source of the message. The codes do not indicate a type of mechanism that detected the message to be an undesired email message.

Further, both *Aronson* and *Paul* describe that the aforementioned processes employed at an email server and not a user’s device that receives email messages from the email server. As such, neither *Aronson* nor *Paul* suggests or teaches, individually or in combination, at least “a user interface installed on the computer device and configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular detection mechanism, wherein each of the detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual representation,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, a

combination of *Aronson* and *Paul* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 1 and fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-8

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 2-8 depend from and include the features of claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-8 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 9

As provided in independent claim 9, Applicant claims:

A system for providing email service, comprising:

means for providing a plurality of detection mechanisms that detect undesired email messages at a user's computing device that receives the email messages from an email server;

means for designating an email message as being undesirable according to a particular detection scheme;

means for marking the email message at the user's computing device with a particular identifier of the particular detection scheme; and

means for displaying the email message at the user's computing device with the particular identifier in a particular visual manner that is associated with the particular identifier, wherein each of the detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual representation.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 9 is allowable for at least the reason that *Aronson* in view of *Paul* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "means for marking the email message at the user's computing device with a particular identifier of the particular detection scheme; and means for displaying the email message at the user's computing device with the particular identifier in a particular visual manner that is associated with the particular identifier, wherein each of the detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual representation," as emphasized above.

Aronson describes a mail server with a filter module 220 that applies a set of rules for detecting spam. "Spam is then deposited in a spam storage area 230 while legitimate e-mail is then sent through to mailbox 140. In an alternative embodiment, spam is initially stored in a mailbox and is subsequently filtered using filter module 220." See col. 4, lines 34-44. The final Office Action states that "*Aronson* does not disclose expressly a user interface configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular mechanism." Page 4. However, the final Office Action asserts that "*Paul* discloses a user interface configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular detection mechanism." Page 4.

In reviewing the reference, *Paul* describes that an electronic mail message that is allowed in accordance with a user's inclusion list is marked with an "OK" display code. Further, an electronic message which does not match data on the user's inclusion list may be determined to be of interest to the user and is marked with a "NEW" display code. An electronic message which does not match data on the user's inclusion list may be determined to not be of interest to the user and is marked with a "JUNK" display code. See abstract. Accordingly, *Paul* discloses that each of these codes characterize the content of a respective message with regard to whether the content is of interest to the user. The codes do not indicate a type of detection mechanism that determined the message to be undesirable.

Similarly, *Paul* describes that "e-mail messages from certain sources may be marked with a display code indicating that they have a 'PRIORITY' status. Different e-mail display colors or folders may be defined based upon the identity of the sender, or the subject matter of the messages." Col. 9, lines 25-31. Again, *Paul* discloses that the codes indicate content of the message or the source of the message. The codes do not indicate a type of mechanism that detected the message to be an undesired email message.

Further, both *Aronson* and *Paul* describe that the aforementioned processes employed at an email server and not a user's device that receives email messages from the email server. As such, neither *Aronson* nor *Paul* suggests or teaches, individually or in combination, at least "means for marking the email message at the user's

computing device with a particular identifier of the particular detection scheme; and means for displaying the email message at the user's computing device with the particular identifier in a particular visual manner that is associated with the particular identifier, wherein each of the detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual representation," as recited in claim 9. Therefore, a combination of *Aronson* and *Paul* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 9 and fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 10-14

For at least the reasons given above, claim 9 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 10-14 depend from and include the features of claim 9 and recite additional features, claims 10-14 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

d. Claim 15

As provided in independent claim 15, Applicant claims:

A method for providing email service, comprising:
providing a plurality of detection approaches for detecting providing
a plurality of detection approaches for detecting undesired email
messages at a user's computing device that receives the email messages
from an email server;

designating an email message as being undesirable according to a
particular detection scheme;

***marking the email message at the user's computing device
with a particular identifier of the particular detection scheme; and***

***displaying the email message at the user's computing device
with the particular identifier in a particular visual manner that is
associated with the particular identifier, wherein each of the
detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual
representation.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 is allowable for at least the reason that *Aronson* in view of *Paul* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least

"marking the email message at the user's computing device with a particular identifier of the particular detection scheme; and displaying the email message at the user's computing device with the particular identifier in a particular visual manner that is associated with the particular identifier, wherein each of the detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual representation," as emphasized above.

Aronson describes a mail server with a filter module 220 that applies a set of rules for detecting spam. "Spam is then deposited in a spam storage area 230 while legitimate e-mail is then sent through to mailbox 140. In an alternative embodiment, spam is initially stored in a mailbox and is subsequently filtered using filter module 220." See col. 4, lines 34-44. The final Office Action states that "*Aronson* does not disclose expressly a user interface configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular mechanism." Page 4. However, the final Office Action asserts that "*Paul* discloses a user interface configured to visually represent that a particular undesired email message was detected using a particular detection mechanism." Page 4.

In reviewing the reference, *Paul* describes that an electronic mail message that is allowed in accordance with a user's inclusion list is marked with an "OK" display code. An electronic message which does not match data on the user's inclusion list may be determined to be of interest to the user and is marked with a "NEW" display code. An electronic message which does not match data on the user's inclusion list may be determined to not be of interest to the user and is marked with a "JUNK" display code. See abstract. Each of these codes characterizes the content of a respective message with regard to whether the content is of interest to the user. The codes do not indicate a type of detection mechanism that detected the message to be an undesired email message.

Similarly, *Paul* describes that "e-mail messages from certain sources may be marked with a display code indicating that they have a 'PRIORITY' status. Different e-mail display colors or folders may be defined based upon the identity of the sender, or the subject matter of the messages." Col. 9, lines 25-31. Again, the codes indicate content of the message or the source of the message. The codes do not indicate a type of detection mechanism that detected the message to be undesirable.

Further, both *Aronson* and *Paul* describe that the aforementioned processes employed at an email server and not a user's device that receives email messages from the email server. As such, neither *Aronson* nor *Paul* suggests or teaches, individually or in combination, at least "marking the email message at the user's computing device with a particular identifier of the particular detection scheme; and displaying the email message at the user's computing device with the particular identifier in a particular visual manner that is associated with the particular identifier, wherein each of the detection mechanisms is represented using a different visual representation," as recited in claim 15. Therefore, a combination of *Aronson* and *Paul* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 15 and fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn.

e. Claims 16-23

For at least the reasons given above, claim 15 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 16-23 depend from and include the features of claim 15 and recite additional features, claims 16-23 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/CWG/

Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500